Driving Under the Influence (DUI) court
Literature review updated February 2014.

As part of WSIPP's research approach to identifying evidence-based programs and policies, WSIPP determines "what works" (and what does not work) to improve outcomes using an approach called meta-analysis. For detail on our methods, see our technical documentation. At this time, WSIPP has not yet calculated benefits and costs for this topic.

Program Description: Driving under the influence (DUI) courts are a therapeutic court typically for offenders with a prior DUI conviction. Participants enter into a contract with the court and agree to comply with treatment and supervision requirements. Non-compliance may resort in the imposition of harsher sentences. DUI courts typically involve a team of stakeholders (e.g., participant, judge, treatment provider, case manager, and supervising officer). While each DUI court is unique, most courts share similar characteristics such as treatment; judicial monitoring; DUI education; abstaining from alcohol; random breath or transdermal testing; incentives, rewards, and sanctions; and progressive stages (e.g, less monitoring with compliance). DUI courts can vary in length. Studies in this systematic review were typically 12 to 24 months in length.

Meta-Analysis of Program Effects

Outcomes measured	Primary or secondary participant	No. of effect sizes	Treatment N	Unadjusted effect size (random effects model)		Adjusted effect sizes and standard errors used in the benefit-cost analysis					
						First time ES is estimated			Second time ES is estimated		
				ES	p-value	ES	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age
Alcohol-related offenses	Primary	6	2424	-0.185	0.049	-0.175	0.091	39	-0.175	0.091	49

Citations Used in the Meta-Analysis

Breckenridge, J.F., Winfree, L.T., Jr., Maupin, J.R., & Clason, D.L. (2000). Drunk drivers, DWI 'drug court' treatment , and recidivism: Who fails? *Justice Research and Policy, 2*(1), 87.

Carey, S.M. Herrera Allen, T. & Einspruch, E. (2012). *San Joaquin DUI monitoring court process and outcome evaluation, final report.* NPC Research. Portland, OR.

Cissner, A.B. (2009). *The drug court model and persistent DWI: An evaluation of the Erie and Niagara DWI/Drug Courts.* Center for Court Innovation. New York, NY.

Fell, J.C., Tippetts, AS., Langston, E.A, United States., & Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation. (2011). *An evaluation of the three Georgia DUI courts.* Washington, D.C.: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Hiller, M., Saum, C., Taylor, L., Watson , C., Hayes, W., & Samuelson, B. (2009). *Waukesha alcohol treatment court: Process and outcomes.* Temple University, Department of Criminal Justice. Philadelphia, PA

Jones, R.K., United States., United States., & Mid-America Research Institute. (2011). *Evaluation of the dui court program in Maricopa County, Arizona.* Washington , D.C.: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

MacDonald, J.M., Morral, A.R., Raymond, B., & Eibner, C. (2007). The efficacy of the Rio Hondo DUI court: A 2-year field experiment. *Evaluation Review, 31*(1), 4-23.

Taylor, E., Zold- Kilbourn, P., Carey, S.M., Fuller, B., & Kissick, K. (2008). *Michigan DUI courts outcome evaluation.* NPC Research. Lansing, MI: Michigan Supreme Court State Court Administrative Office.

Washington State Institute for Public Policy